



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/286,530 04/05/99 CHAPOY

L 7651/1239

000757 QM22/0622  
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO IL 60610

EXAMINER

FREBILIC, F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3738

DATE MAILED:

06/22/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/286,530**

Applicant  
**Chapoy et al**

Examiner  
**Paul Prebilic**

Art Unit  
**3738**



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 16, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 24-39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 40-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3738

Claims 24-39 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 6 filed October 23, 2000.

***Claim Rejections Based Upon Prior Art***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-14, 40-42, and 44-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Patel (US 5,252,262) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Patel (US 5,252,262) in view of Bruns et al (US 4,737,322). Patel discloses that the haptic of the intraocular device can be made of a sheath/core structure of polyimide as one of the materials. For this reason, if the sheath and core were both made of polyimide, the claim language would be

Art Unit: 3738

fully met; see the whole document, especially Figures 1-3 and 26-29 as well as column 4, lines 5-57.

Alternatively, making the sheath and out of polyimide is not explicitly disclosed so one could interpret Patel as not meeting the claim language fully. Bruns et al, however, teaches that it was known to make haptics out of polyimide in order to provide a high melting polymer for this element; see column 6, lines 25-39. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been at least obvious to make the sheath and core of Patel out of polyimide for the same reasons that Burns et al does the same.

With regard to claims 2, 9-14 and 44-53, the product-by-process steps are only given weight to the extent that they affect the final product with little burden on the Examiner's part to meet the claim language; see MPEP 2113 which is incorporated herein by reference thereto. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that the claim product-by-process limitations result in an identical, or alternatively, a substantially identical product to that disclosed by Patel such that the claims are clearly unpatentable thereover.

With regard to claim 40-53, the polyimide as claimed is the same material as that set forth by Patel, such that it would inherently have the same fibrosis promotion affect.

Claims 4, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel and Bruns et al as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-14, 40-42 and 44-53 above, and further in view of Patel et al (US 6,158,862).

Art Unit: 3738

With regard to claims 4 and 6, Patel does not disclose a silicone or HEMA (i.e. hydroxylethylmethacrylate) optic as claimed. Patel et al, however, discloses that it was known to make optics out of silicone or HEMA; see column 4, lines 7-14. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to make the optic of Patel out of silicone or HEMA for the same reasons the prior art does the same and since there is no criticality to such a selection of materials.

With regard to claim 8, Patel does not disclose the use of a UV absorbing dye as claimed. Patel et al, however, teaches that it was known to make lenses containing UV absorbing dye in order to protect the retina. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to do the same with the Patel intraocular optic for the same reasons that Patel does the same.

Claims 15-18, 20, 22, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel and Bruns et al as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-14, 40-42 and 44-53 above, and further in view of Cumming (US 5,047,051). Patel meets the claim language except for the footplate or opposing set of plates as claimed. Cumming, however, teaches that it was known to make haptics into opposing plate or footplate forms; see the figures and the rest of the document. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to make the polyimide haptics of Patel into a plate form and to coat the entire haptics thereof with polyamide for the same reasons that Cumming forms his haptics into that form.

Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel, Bruns et al, and Cumming as applied to claims 15-18, 20, 22, and 43 above, and further in view of

Art Unit: 3738

Patel et al (US 6,158,862). Patel additionally fails to disclose the use of silicone or HEMA as required by the present claims. Patel et al, however, discloses that it was known to make optics out of silicone or HEMA; see column 4, lines 7-14. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to make the optic of Patel out of silicone or HEMA for the same reasons the prior art does the same and since there is no criticality to such a selection of materials.

*Response to Arguments*


Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 and 40-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a list of all copending applications that set forth similar subject matter to the present claims. A copy of such copending claims is respectfully requested in response to this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Prebilic whose telephone number is (703) 308-2905. The examiner normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on (703) 308-2111. The fax phone number for this Technology Center is (703) 305-3580.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

  
Paul Prebilic  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3738